CHESAPEAKE BAY LOCAL ASSISTANCE DEPARTMENT CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION OF LOCAL PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Note: Questions that appear in italics are designed to be helpful to the reviewed in the overall evaluation of a local program. A negative answer to these questions does not, in and of itself, indicate an inconsistent program but may indicate problem areas.

PART 1. CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION AREAS

A. General Designation Criteria

			were used in the designation of CBPAs?	
Are these		 uble to CBLA	D to use in the review of both RPAs and RMAs?	
	ommended r		re unavailable to the locality?	
		hich CBPAs v	were mapped been outlined in a textual statement? Document:	
recommen	ndations for	resource pro	As compare to the local comprehensive plan and otection therein?	
Has the lo Bay Prese	ocality incluervation Are	ded federal a as?	and state owned lands in their designation of Chesape	ake?
Has the lo area?		nated lands v	within its jurisdiction that are outside the Bay drainage Document:	ge

B. Resource Protection Areas

	ands connected			tributary streams, nontidal o tidal wetlands or tributary
	Yes	No	Discrepancies:	
	the locality des	-	•	ature? What justification is provided
	Yes	No	Document:	
	Yes	No	Discrepancies:	
C.	Resource M	anagement Aı	reas	
comp	onents outlined	in § 3.3 of the		extent of the environmental dplains, highly erodible soils, highly he RPA]
	Yes	No	Discrepancies:	
	the locality des ded for inclusio	•	lands" as an RMA fe	cature? What justification is
	Yes	No	Document:	

	N	
Yes	No	Document:
Does the RPA follo	w watershed bo	undaries?
Yes	No	Partial
-		ear distance in conjunction with the geographic extent of or 500 feet, whichever is greater)?
Yes	No	Document:
	•	r distance for designating the width of the RMA, is this nents outlined above?
Yes	No	Document:
parcel is within a C	BPA, the entire	ude a provision which requires where a portion of a lot or e lot or parcel shall comply to the requirements of the risdiction-wide designation)
Yes	No	Document:
	-	nt" approach, does it establish a minimum RMA he minimum RMA width?
Yes	No	
	l in the Regulati	ory, what percent of the jurisdiction has RMA ions? How does this percent compare to the percent of
	-	lude most of the vacant land within the jurisdiction ipated growth and development?
	•	
Yes	No	Document:

		ompass an arec ia to work effec	a large enough for best management practices and other ctively?
	Yes	No	Documentation:
D.	Intensely I	Developed Area	as
How	has the locali	ty designated II	DAs; are they shown as an <u>overlay</u> of RPAs and RMAs?
	Yes	No	Documentation:
Has t	he locality pr	ovided any just	ification for the designation of certain areas as IDAs?
	Yes	No	Documentation:
		_	esignating IDAs ("areas of existing development and ural environment remains") been met?
	Yes	No	Discrepancies:
	nation? Developi impervio Public se	ment has severely as cover; wer and water is c	altered the natural state of the area such that it has more than 50% onstructed and currently serves the area by October 1, 1989. This area planned for public sewer and water;
3.	Housing	density is equal to	or greater than 4 dwelling units per acre.
	Yes	No	Documentation:
PAR'	T II.	LAND USI CRITERIA	E AND DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE
A.	Purpose and	d Intent	
Does	the ordinance	e include a purp	ose and/or authority statement?
	Yes	No	Documentation:

Chap		v	Code included? [§§ 10.1-2108, 10.1-2109, 10.1-2111 of or Virginia; if zoning ordinance is local vehicle, also
	Yes	No	Documentation:
_			gulations? [VR 173-02-01. Chesapeake Bay Preservation t Regulations.]
	Yes	No	Documentation:
B.	Definitions		
Are th	ne definitions c	onsistent with	the Regulations? [§ 1.4]
	Yes	No	Documentation:
defini water	tions necessary quality standp	to fit with exioint?	? (see Model Ordinance). Are deviations from sting local ordinance definitions and defensible from a
	Applicability		
is the	re a section wh	ich identifies t	the locality's CBPA map? Within the ordinance(s) text, he components of the Resource Protection Area as 2.B]
	Yes	No	Documentation:
Are a	ll components	of the RPA (in	cluding "other lands") defined?
	Yes	No	Documentation:
	Resource Man nation? [§ 3.3.2	-	identified accurately in relation to the local RMA
	Yes	No	Documentation:

adop	oted by the local g	government a	IDAs strictly limited to those areas designated and as an overlay to CBPAs? (As opposed to allowing IDA status in the future.)
	Yes	No	Documentation:
		• •	areas by reference to the proper citation for IDAs [§ 3.4] text describe the specific boundaries of designated IDAs?
			r site-specific boundaries based on more reliable or n Environmental Site Assessments? [§4.1.B]
	Yes	No	Docume ntation:
perfo demo or st	ormance of an en onstrates an abse tudy to be prepar	vironmental ence of RMA ed by a soil s or a wetland	"provision from the performance standards (based on the site assessment or "RMA limits study", etc. which component), does the ordinance require such assessment scientist (for demonstration of highly erodible or ls scientist (nontidal wetlands, hydric soils)? Documentation:
D.	Performance	Standards	
1.	General Perfo	rmance Crite	ria
	nt mechanism(s) vifically:	vill the locali	ity employ to minimize land disturbance? More
	Does the loca	lity establish	a threshold for land disturbance in CBPAs?
	Yes	No	Documentation:
	Does the loca	lity include r	requirements for minimum open space within CBPAs?
	? What of What is what p	are the minin zoning classi percentages a	districts have such requirements; num percentages? fications are exempt from open space requirements and loes this represent of total development in CBPAs?
	Yes	No	Documentation:

What other mechandisturbance?	nisms, not identi	fied above, will the locality employ to minimize land
Documentation:		
Does the locality in point during constr	-	ents which limit ingress and egress where possible to one a.1.d]
Yes	No	Documentation:
and limit clearing of	or grading to the	ved site plan prior to any clearing or grading of the site e area depicted on the approved site plan? (Note that this ling" and not "clearing and grading.")
Yes	No	Documentation:
Does the locality rephysically posted a	-	of clearing and grading to be shown on site plans and
Yes	No	Documentation:
What mechanism(s specifically:) will the localit	ty employ to minimize impervious cover? More
	•	reshold for impervious cover? Documentation:
spaces and	drives within C. visions for perv	parking area requirements to reduce the size of parking BPAs or reduce the number of parking spaces? Do they ious material in constructing parking areas and
Yes	No	Documentation:
What other mechanimpervious cover?	nisms, not identi	fied above, will the locality employ to minimize
Documentation:		
What mechanism(s) will the localit	ty employ in order to preserve indigenous vegetation?
•		ved site plan (or landscape plan) which depicts all trees e to be removed prior to any clearing or grading?
Yes	No	Documentation:

Does the locality's ordinance include language for tree preservation and tree protection? [§ 4.2.2]
YesNo Documentation:
What other mechanisms, not identified above, will the locality employ to preserve indigenous vegetation?
Documentation:
2. Erosion and Sediment Control
Does the ordinance(s) implement the requirement that all land disturbance over 2500 square feet have an approved erosion and sediment control plan? [§ 4.2.6]
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance(s) disallow the exemptions granted by § 10.1-560 of the Code of Virginia for septic drainfields and single family housing [§ 4.2.6]
YesNo Documentation:
Has the local Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance been amended and cross-referenced with the overlay district or other ordinance implementing the performance criteria? (This can be accomplished in the Second Year Program but notation of it should be made now in the first year review.) [§§ 2.2.F, 4.2.6]
YesNo Documentation:
Has the locality indicated how it will enforce this requirement, particularly, the inclusion of all single-family dwellings? Recommendations:
? Use a simple application ("Agreement in lieu of a formal E & S Control Plan") and approval process.
? Institute a training program for building inspectors, who typically do on-site inspections;
? Provide for spot checks for single-family dwellings accompanied by a quick enforcement response in instances of noncompliance.
YesNo Documentation:

3. Agricultural Requirements

including the requirements for a soil and water conservation plan (plan based upon the Field Office Technical Guide of the U.S. Department of Agricultural Soil Conservation Service and approved by the local Soil and Water Conservation District by January 1, 1995) and buffer areas? No Yes Documentation: Has the locality secured an agreement with the local Soil and Water Conservation District? Yes No Documentation: What kind of notification is being provided to area farmers? 4. Septic System Requirements Are both requirements in the Regulations (pump-out and reserve drainfield) included in the ordinance(s)? [§ 4.2.7] No Documentation: Yes Have the local Health Code regulations been amended and/or cross-referenced? Yes No Documentation: Has the locality secured an agreement with their local sanitarian for enforcement of the new regulations? Yes No Documentation:

Has the locality made provisions to ensure that all existing septic systems within CBPAs

Documentation:

Has the locality incorporated all requirements for agricultural lands in the ordinance(s),

meet the requirement of periodic pump-out?

Yes No

noti requ	fication to prope	erty owners wi hased? Do the	-out requirements will the locality employ? What ll it provide? Is compliance with the pump-out ese provisions attempt to target areas with the olders?	ū
5.	Plan of Deve	lopment		
	es the ordinance is are feet within C		of development process for any development over 4]	2500
	Yes	No	Documentation:	
	es the ordinance wirements?	establish any	exemptions from the plan of development review	
	Yes	No	Documentation:	
requ		ministered in	sions so that any exemptions from the plan of deve a manner that ensures compliance with the Act an	-
	Yes	No	Documentation:	
	es the ordinance(ee provisions else	•	uirements for a site plan, if the locality does not h	ave
	Yes	No	Documentation:	
	es the plan of dev etermine site-spe	_	ude an environmental site assessment which will bies of the RPA?	e used
	Yes	No	Documentation:	
Doe	es the plan of dev	relopment incl	ude requirements for a stormwater management p	lan?
	Yes	No	Documentation:	

Do the requirements for stormwater management plans provide adequate specificity for the preparation of such plans?
YesNo Documentation:
Does the plan of development include requirements for an erosion and sediment control pla or is reference made to existing E & S plan requirements?
YesNo Documentation:
Is the process of obtaining a wetlands permit expressly coordinated with the process for sit plan or subdivision plan review and approval?
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance(s) ensure that an applicant would not be able to get a grading or buildin permit approved until <u>all necessary wetlands permits have been obtained</u> ? [§ 4.2.11]
YesNo Documentation:
(Note: this may be easier to administer for RPA wetlands; what is the locality's process for upland areas and nontidal wetlands?) Specifically:
? Does the locality require and environmental site assessment for all development within CBPAs? As an alternative, does the locality require suc an assessment for developments over a threshold size?
? Will the locality make us of the environmental inventory mapping in the review process?
Are changes to the local wetlands board review process necessary and have these been accomplished?
YesNo Documentation:
6. Stormwater Management [§ 4.2.8]
Does the locality require a <u>no net increase in pollutant loads</u> for new development?
YesNo Documentation:

Has the locality indicated in the ordinance(s) the existing nutrient base load based on average land cover conditions? (.45lbs P/ac/yr vs. distinct average loads for each subwatershed within locality)
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance include a provision which specifies the calculation procedure for redevelopment shall be the same for both pre- and post-development?
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance(s) specify that for redevelopment projects, original post-development nonpoint source pollution loadings may be submitted for existing development loadings if design data is available?
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance(s) require a 10 % reduction in pollutant loads for redevelopment sites?
YesNo Documentation:
Is there the ability for administrative waivers of the 10% requirements, provided the following:
 ? in no case will the post-development runoff exceed pre-development load; ? runoff pollution loads must have been calculated and the BMPs selected for the expressed purpose of controlling nonpoint source pollution; ? existing BMPs are proven to be in good working order and performing at design level
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance(s) require regular or periodic maintenance of BMPs and maintenance agreements between owner or developer and local government? [§ 4.2.3]
YesNo Documentation:
7. Buffer Area Requirements [§ 4.3.B]
Are buffer area requirements in the ordinance(s) consistent with the Regulations? Has the 100-foot buffer area performance criteria been identified in the ordinance(s)?
YesNo Documentation:

Is there adequate language to protect the buffer from encroachment? (e.g. tree replacement requirements, guidelines for vegetation removal consistent with the Regulations, requirements for path construction to control erosion, requirements for shoreline stabilization projects with are consistent with the Regulations.) [§ 4.3.B.1]
YesNo Documentation:
Does the ordinance(s) include the provisions for relief for lots recorded prior to October 1, 1989, consistent with the Regulations? (minimum modifications necessary, area equal to that encroached upon established if possible, in no case shall the reduce portion of the buffer area be less than 50 feet) [§ 4.3.B.2]
YesNo Documentation:
Are IDA areas exempt automatically from the buffer area requirements or does the ordinance require case-by-case determination of such exemptions?
Explanation Documentation:
Is there language which will establish buffer areas in redevelopment over time? [§ 4.3.B.3]
YesNo Documentation:
Are agricultural lands which include RPA features required to have buffer areas?
YesNo Documentation:
Are reductions to the agricultural buffer area allowed according to the regulations? [§ 4.3.B.4] Specifically:
? to a minimum of 50 feet when adjacent land is implementing a federal, state, or locally funded agricultural BMP program, provided the program and the reduced buffer provide equivalent water quality protection, pollutant removal, and water resource conservation of the full buffer area.
? to a minimum of 25 feet when a soil and water quality conservation plan approved by the local Soil and Water Conservation District has been implemented, provided that the portion of the plan for CBPAs achieves water quality protection at least the equivalent of the full buffer in the opinion of the local SWCD Board.
? buffer area is not required for (perennial) agricultural drainage ditches if the adjacent land has in place BMPs in accordance with a conservation plan approved by the local SWCD. (Note: Buffer area are not required for intermittent drainage ditches)
YesNo Documentation:

8. Performance Criteria for RPAs

Regul	lations? [§ 4.3	5.A]			
	Yes	No	Documentation:		
Are c	onditions for l	RPA developme	ent clearly established?		
?	New or expanded water-dependent facility may be allowed provided: it does not conflict with the comprehensive plan; complies with the performance criteria outlined above; any non water-dependent component is located outside the RPA; access with be provided with minimum disturbance, where possible, a single point of access.				
	Yes	No	Documentation:		
	-		nce(s) to ensure that any new lot will be large enough to ce requirements, including the required buffer area?		
	Yes	No	Documentation:		
		• •	a water quality impact assessment for <u>any</u> development ents into the landward 50 feet of the buffer area?		
	Yes	No	Documentation:		
9.	Water Quali	ity Impact Asse	ssment (WQIA) [§§ 4.3.A, 5.6.E]		
such a	• •	ecause of the ur	r other developments outside the RPA that may warrant nique characteristics of the site or intensity of the		
	Yes	No	Documentation:		
	-		the WQIA? Do the elements provide enough information water quality?		

Who is the reviewing agency in the locality? Is there a distinction in the levels of water quality impact assessment? What is the difference?				
YesNo Documentation:				
E. Nonconforming Use and Development Waivers [§ 4.5.A]				
Does the ordinance permit the continued use of existing structures? Does the locality permit the expansion of nonconforming structures?				
YesNo Documentation:				
Is there an administrative review procedure established for expansion of nonconforming structures or lots? Does this procedure include the following:				
no net increase in nonpoint source pollution;				
any development over 2500 square feet shall comply with the local erosion and sediment control ordinance.				
YesNo Documentation:				
Does the locality require the submission of a sketch or site plan with the name of the applicant, the legal description of the property, a sketch of the proposed improvements, the boundary of the RPA, the location of any existing private water supply or sewage system?				
YesNo Documentation:				
Is there a time limit on the nonconforming development waiver?				
YesNo Documentation:				
F. Exemptions				
Does the ordinance(s) specify provisions addressing the exemption of the construction, installation, operation, and maintenance of electric gas, and telephone transmission lines, railroads, and public roads and their appurtenant structures in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Law [§ 10.1-560 et seq. of the Code of Virginia] or an erosion and sediment control plan approved by the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board as constituting compliance with the Regulations?				
YesNo Documentation:				

Does the ordinance(s) allow the construction, installation, and maintenance of water, sewer, and local gas lines to be exempt from the criteria provided that: ? such facilities are located to the maximum extent possible outside the RPA; ? land disturbance is minimized; ? construction is in accordance with all federal and state permits and designed and constructed to promote water quality protection; ? any land disturbance which exceeds 2500 square feet shall conform to erosion and sediment control requirements [§ 4.5.B.2] No Yes Documentation: Does the ordinance allow exemptions in the RPA for the following: water wells, passive recreation facilities such as boardwalks, trails and pathways; historic preservation and archeological activities, provided that such development is accomplished with the local administrative review, any land disturbance exceeding 2500 square feet shall comply with erosion and sediment control requirements. [§ 4.5.C] Yes No Documentation: What other exemptions does the ordinance(s) specify? Are other exemptions consistent with the spirit and intent of the Act and Regulations? Yes No Documentation: G. Exceptions [§ 4.6] Does the ordinance provide for exceptions to the criteria? Yes No Documentation: Are such exceptions limited to the "minimum necessary to afford relief" and does the ordinance state that "reasonable and appropriate conditions upon any exception granted shall be imposed as necessary so that the purpose and intent of the Act is preserved"?

Documentation:

___Yes ___ No

	a defined ex ewing agenc		s, with unnecessary hardship proven for each case? Is
	Yes	No	Documentation:
			e exception or variance process include the water quality additions to be imposed?
	Yes	No	Documentation:
Н.	Enforcemen	ıt	
the depareview	artment or pe stormwater c	ersonnel to revie calculations and	oach to enforcing the ordinance(s)? Have they identified ew site plans, enforce erosion and sediment control, determine which BMPs are acceptable, perform on-site and Sediment Control?